DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 434 370 CS 510 125

AUTHOR Leslie, Larry Z.
TITLE Value System Changes Resulting from a Media Ethics Course: A Postmodern Perspective.
PUB DATE 1999-08-00
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (82nd, New Orleans, LA, August 4-7, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Ethical Instruction; *Ethics; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Mass Media; Student Attitudes; Values
IDENTIFIERS Postmodernism

ABSTRACT

This pre- and post-test study examined value system changes resulting from a media ethics course. Over three semesters, 74 students participated in the study. They were given M. Rokeach's lists of terminal and instrumental values on the first day and again on the last day of class and asked to rank each value on the lists in terms of its importance to them. The study was designed to answer several questions about the degree to which formal instruction in ethics could be influential in students changing the relative importance of several values, particularly those deemed important and less important to contemporary, postmodern culture. Results indicated that, for the most part, students were very much in step with postmodern culture. Only small changes were observed in their value systems. (Contains 13 references and 6 tables of data.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 434 370

Value System Changes Resulting from a Media Ethics Course: A Postmodern Perspective

By

Larry Z. Leslie
University of South Florida, CIS 1040
Tampa, Florida 33620

(813) 974-6798
lleslie@chuma.cas.usf.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented to the Media Ethics Interest Group
AEJMC Convention, New Orleans
August, 1999

L. Leslie

Running Head: Value Changes

CS 510 125

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This pre- and post-test study examined value system changes resulting from a media ethics course. Over three semesters, seventy-four students participated in the study. They were given Rokeach's lists of terminal and instrumental values on the first day and again on the last day of class and asked to rank each value on the lists in terms of its importance to them. The study was designed to answer several questions about the degree to which formal instruction in ethics could be influential in students changing the relative importance of several values, particularly those deemed *important* and *less important* to contemporary, postmodern culture. Results indicated that for the most part students were very much in step with postmodern culture. Only small changes were observed in their value systems.

Value System Changes Resulting from a Media Ethics Course: A Postmodern Perspective

This study examines the values of mass communications students before and after undergoing formal training in mass media ethics. The study of values is important for several reasons. Bok (1995) suggests that certain basic values have been formulated in every society and are necessary to collective survival. She also notes that certain values are widely recognized, but not necessarily held at the same level of importance by different individuals or groups (pp. 13, 17). The term "value" comes from the Latin *valere*, "to be of worth" (Black, Rawlins, Viall, and Plumley, 1992) and has its roots in the works of Plato, Aristotle, and Kant, among others.

Rokeach (1973) defines a value as "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence," while a value system is "an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance" (p. 5). It is generally agreed that values influence behavior. In fact, some believe that every aspect of human life is related to values (Fritzsche, 1995; Fekete, 1987). In recent years, the general public has become more aware of ethical issues in all aspects of contemporary life, especially government and the professions, in part because both media and institutions of higher education "have been influenced by and have contributed to the level of [ethical] awareness" (Rosen, 1980, p. 172).

Rationale for the Study

One of the goals of most media ethics courses is to encourage and promote ethical

problem solving by students who will soon become employees in media industries. "Courses which examine moral problems faced by professionals are based on the premise that it is better to wrestle with the problems before they become pressing" (Rosen, 1980, p. 172). Equally important is the notion that "morality develops," an idea originally articulated by Plato. This concept gained "its first empirical validation through the work of Jean Piaget and his associates," and later in the work of Lawrence Kohlberg (Lickona, 1980, p. 113).

A study of value system changes in mass communications students enrolled in a media ethics course is one way to assess the degree to which ethics course materials and activities may have some influence. No cause-effect relationship is suggested here. We learn our moral views from a variety of sources and in a variety of situations. It is possible that changes in value salience result from forces other than an ethics class. Nevertheless, because an ethics class is a significant part of a student's educational experience for a semester, it is likely that the activity may have some influence on changes in a student's value system. In short, causality is out of the question, correlation is the best we can hope for.

Values have not been widely studied by mass communication scholars, particularly whether values change as a result of formal instruction in ethics. One of the early studies was Surlin's (1987) examination of value changes among 20 Canadian students in his ethics class. More recently, Black, Rawlins, Viall, and Plumley (1992) reported the results of a two semester study of more than 200 students. The Black et. al study took issue with "some of Surlin's conclusions about the nature of value systems, the potential of a single ethics course to affect

those systems, and the ramifications of those changes vis-a-vis professional performance" (p. 1). While many of the linkages between instruction and performance remain unclear, it is generally accepted that "the study of personal values can add to our understanding of ethical behavior in the workplace" (Finegan & Theriault, 1997, p. 722).

An Historical and Cultural Context

As Rosen (1980) suggests, "we learn our moral views just as we learn most other things, from the combined influences of family, friends, school, church, TV, and other sources" (p. 171). In other words, much of what we learn about moral values comes from our cultural environment. This cultural environment provides a context for understanding which values are considered important and why.

Our current cultural environment has been described by some scholars and philosophers as *postmodern*. If one looks at cultural periods from an historical viewpoint, it seems clear that any particular era has its limits, that is, its starting and its ending. For example, the ancient Egyptian civilization was dominant early but was replaced by the ancient Greek culture which had its time of influence. The Greek culture yielded to the Roman culture and so on down through the years to the modern age, said by some to begin as early as the mid-1400s, but located by others as the era following the Enlightenment, an age of reason and science (c. 1850). The modern age was characterized by the Industrial Revolution and the rise of capitalism as a global influence. Now, some say, we have gone beyond the modern age to the postmodern era, a cultural period characterized by an information and technological revolution and the emergence of a truly global

economy.

The concept of *postmodernism*--the theoretical foundations and cultural qualities of the postmodern era--crystallized in the mid-1970s, although the term had been used by a number of writers in the 1950s and 1960s (Connor, 1997). However, the term's first use may extend to the 1870s (Appignanesi and Garratt, 1995, p. 3). Essentially, postmodernism is a theory of contemporary culture, one that rejects the beliefs and practices of the modern age and holds that our present culture is characterized by a discontinuity and ambiguity in all phases of life: ironies and inconsistencies abound, universals cannot be discovered through reason. Postmodernists resist a single world view and avoid simple explanations for complex situations. This theory has been taken seriously by some academic disciplines, but given scant attention by others.

Rosenau (1992) makes several important observations about postmodernism and its influence on the social sciences. Truth involves order, rules, and values, and depends on reason and logic, yet "almost all post-modernists reject truth even as a goal or ideal because it is the very epitome of modernity" (p. 77). In contemporary culture, they argue, truth has been "replaced with new forms of postmodern 'clarity'...recognition of our own will to power..." (p. 89). Additionally, "postmodernists question authority and the arbitrary imposition of any single, systematic, point of view...[and] tolerate different, even contradictory perspectives" (p. 13). These ideas clearly oppose many of the concepts and practices of social science scholars, particularly those who believe that the modern age's logical positivist tradition--characterized by the scientific method and quantitative measurement--is sufficiently able to answer any questions they might have.

There are other important qualities of postmodern culture, and many of them figure prominently in the present study. Postmodern thinkers reject reason as a means to truth, they see science as just another narrative paradigm, neither better nor worse than social, political, spiritual, or economic paradigms; they question authority, are comfortable with uncertainty, and believe that reality is image-based. In short, as Gitlin (1999) observes, "postmodernism is an art of erosion" (p. 216). The qualities and characteristics of the modern age are being eroded by the philosophies and practices of the postmodern era. This means, of course, that moral values are changing along with the culture. The institutions and principles that anchored ethical practices in the modern age no longer seem to hold. Ethical decision making in postmodern culture is difficult.

To what degree do today's journalism and mass communications students hold the moral values of a postmodern culture? Can a media ethics class be influential in changing value salience among these students, in drawing them away from the vagaries of postmodern culture toward more rational, less self-centered ethical decision making? These two questions provide the overall focus for the present study.

Research Questions

If one accepts that we are currently in the postmodern era, and if one examines Rokeach's lists of terminal and instrumental values, it seems apparent that some of the values on the lists would be deemed important and others less important in contemporary culture. In terms of Rokeach's terminal values, a postmodern student could be expected to emphasize four values as

important: *a comfortable life, self-respect, inner harmony, freedom*. These values, as conceptually defined by Rokeach, reflect the postmodern emphasis on high consumption and the elevation of the self. Conversely, the postmodern student could be expected not to assign much importance to five instrumental values: *courageous, logical, obedient, responsible, self-controlled*. These values, as defined by Rokeach, stress standing up for your beliefs, consistent rational thinking, a respect for rules and conventions, and inner direction/self-discipline, none of which is of very much importance in postmodern culture.

This taxonomy of values, that is, the placing of certain values in categories deemed "important" or "less important" to an individual in postmodern culture, is more than mere whimsy or convenience. It directly follows from a delineation of postmodern thought as presented in the work of Michel Foucault, Jean Baudrillard, Jacques Derrida, Jean-Francois Lyotard, and others.

However, placing a value in either the "important" or "less important" category depends on more than simply an extrapolation of a value's importance in postmodern culture. Much depends on Rokeach's conceptual definitions for the values. For example, it could be argued that *happiness* is (and has always been) an important value for all sorts of people in all sorts of cultures. Still, Rokeach defines happiness as "contentedness." Postmodern culture does not have much to say about contentedness; if interpreted literally, the word means "moderately satisfied" which is not the definition most people would give to happiness. Many people are content, but all those who are content may not be happy. In short, Rokeach's conceptual

definitions--which are provided in parenthesis below each value on the list--must be considered in deciding which values to place in specific categories.

What about the values on Rokeach's list that do not fit any particular conceptual postmodern category? If not addressed by postmodern culture, the values must be allowed to find their own level, that is, they continue to be a part of the research study, but no specific questions about their importance in contemporary culture can be asked beyond what is generally known about the value. Allowing the values not addressed by the research questions to "float" to their own level should in itself be revealing.

Some empirical work exists that supports the notion that, for college students, some values are more important than others in contemporary culture. For example, a 1997 survey of more than 250,000 college students by researchers at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) revealed that "students are increasingly disengaged," and that they are less interested in expanding their minds than in increasing their incomes. An astonishing 74.9 percent chose being well-off as an essential goal, while 40.8 percent chose developing a philosophy as an essential goal. These results contrast sharply with results from a similar survey in 1968, where the numbers were essentially reversed: 40.8 percent chose financial security and 82.5 percent chose developing a philosophy as their essential goal (Associated Press report, 1998).

Accordingly, the following research questions are posed:

Prior to formal instruction in ethics, do students rank as important the four terminal values of importance to postmodern culture: *a comfortable life, self-respect, inner harmony, freedom*?

Prior to formal instruction in ethics, do students rank as less important the five instrumental values that postmodern culture considers unimportant: *courageous, logical, obedient, responsible, self-controlled?* After formal instruction in ethics, do the rankings of the terminal and instrumental values noted above change, and, if so, to what degree?

For purposes of the present study, a value will be deemed as "important" if it is ranked in the upper half of the list of eighteen. A value will be deemed "less important" if it is ranked in the bottom half of the list.

Method

Seventy-four students enrolled in a mass media ethics course at a major southern university during the Spring 1997, Fall 1997, and Summer 1998 semesters, were used as subjects for this pre- and post test research study. In several respects, the present study differs from both the Surlin (1987) study and the Black et. al (1992) study. Surlin's sample was composed of 20 Canadian students; the ethics class met for 12 weeks; it utilized case-study materials as the primary basis for ethical problem-solving discussions. The Black et. al (1992) quasi-experimental study utilized a purposive sample of 206 students drawn from two semesters. Black and his colleagues' sample included 135 students in media ethics courses and used 71 students from other courses as a control group.

The present study examined 74 students over three semesters. During the first class meeting, students responded to Rokeach's (1973) list of 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values (pp. 359-361). A terminal value, such as *a world at peace* or *social recognition*, can be classified

as either personal or social, that is, self- or society-centered. Instrumental values, such as *polite* or *honest*, can be classified as "desirable modes of conduct" (p. 5). Rokeach's values are considered to be universally held, but may differ in saliency from individual to individual, group to group, or culture to culture (Surlin, p, 566). Rokeach uses a rank-ordering protocol whereby the most important values in one's system are ranked one, two, etc., while those of less importance to the individual are ranked lower.

Following the pre-test, class activities began. For the next 14 weeks, activities included a lecture on postmodern culture and the ethical issues it raises, student reports on the philosophical foundations of ethics, the presentation of a dozen case studies dealing with a variety of media, and three essay assignments where students were encouraged to select and apply specific ethical philosophies in their solutions to ethical problems. Essay topics were drawn from fresh case studies. On the last day of class, students again rank-ordered their value system using Rokeach's instrumental and terminal values. Pre- and post-test value means and ranks were then compared.

Results

Rankings. On the pre-test, students in the Spring 97 ethics class (n=30) ranked *happiness* as their most important terminal value. *Self-respect, inner harmony, family security,* and *freedom* rounded out the top five. At the bottom of their list, students placed *equality, a world at peace, social recognition, a world of beauty,* and *national security*. On the post-test, there was little change. The same five values were ranked at the top, although two of them changed places, *inner harmony* (-2) and *freedom* (+2). On the list of 18, no value changed more

than two ranks. Much of the change observed in this group of students occurred among values in the bottom half of the list (see Table 1).

--Table 1 Here--

Changes were more noticeable for the instrumental values. On the pre-test, *honest*, *loving*, *responsible*, *independent*, and *ambitious* were ranked as the top five values, with *forgiving*, *logical*, *self-control*, *clean*, and *obedient* occupying the bottom five ranks. As with the terminal values, the post test showed little change in the top five. *Ambitious* was replaced by *intellectual* (+3) as the fifth most important value for these students. Most of the changes evident on the instrumental list occurred with the values in the middle of the list. *Imaginative* (-4) and *capable* (+3), along with *intellectual* (+3), were values with the greatest change (see Table 2).

--Table 2 Here--

Like their peers in the Spring term class, students in the Fall 97 ethics class (n=22) ranked *happiness* as their most important terminal value on the pre-test. Other values in the top five included *self-respect*, *family security*, *inner harmony*, and *freedom*. *Social recognition*, *national security* and *a world of beauty* were ranked lowest. The post-test showed even less change than students in the Spring semester. *A comfortable life*, a value ranked in the middle of the list gained one and a half ranks (from 9.5 to 8). Other values were either unchanged or changed only one rank (see Table 3). As with students in the Spring, Fall students had some interesting, although small, changes on the instrumental values list. *Honest*, *ambitious*, *loving*, *responsible*, and *independent* occupied the top five ranks on the pre-test; four of these five swapped positions on

the post-test, but none dropped from the top five. The greatest change among the values at the top was observed for *responsible* (+2). *Logical, polite, clean*, and *obedient* were ranked at the bottom on the pre-test. Only *logical* made an important move on the post-test, up four and a half ranks. In the middle of the list, *self-controlled* lost three ranks (from 9 to 12). Other changes were minor (see Table 4).

--Tables 3 & 4 Here--

In the Summer 1998, students in the ethics class (n=22) showed a bit more willingness to change their values on both the terminal and instrumental lists. For the terminal values pre-test, students ranked *self-respect* first and *happiness* second. *Family security, freedom*, and *wisdom* completed the top five. Values at the bottom included *social recognition, national security*, and *a world of beauty*. On the post-test, one value, *inner harmony*, gained five ranks, leaping from the ninth rank to the fourth, replacing *freedom*. The bottom three values remained the same on the post-test. Change was more noticeable for this group of students than for the previous two groups. Only four values--*self-respect, happiness, a world at peace*, and *social recognition*--failed to change. The others had small changes, usually one or two ranks (see Table 5).

--Table 5 Here--

On the instrumental list, change was more evident. On the pre-test, summer students ranked the same five values at the top: *responsible, honest, independent, ambitious*, and *loving*. *Logical*, however, moved from the 16th rank to the 13th rank, a sizable move, but not enough to

move it into the top half of the list. Other important changes included the movement of *intellectual* from the tenth to the fifth rank, and the loss of four ranks by *ambitious* and *courage*. Only two values on the instrumental list failed to change--*polite* and *imaginative*, ranked 14th and 15th, respectively. Overall, changes were small, but more numerous than in either of the two previous semesters (see Table 6).

--Table 6 Here--

Research Questions. Prior to formal instruction in ethics, do students rank as important the four terminal values of importance to postmodern culture: *a comfortable life, self-respect, inner harmony*, and *freedom*? Yes, with one exception. Students in the Spring 97 and Fall 97 classes ranked *a comfortable life* as less important. The three other values were all ranked as important by students in all three classes.

Prior to formal instruction in ethics, do students rank as less important the five instrumental values postmodern culture considers less important: *courageous, logical, obedient, responsible, self-controlled*? Yes, to some extent. All three classes indicated that *logical* and *obedient* were less important values. The students clearly rejected the notion that *responsible* was less important by ranking that value in the top five in importance. Rankings for *courageous* also showed that students consider this value important. Results for *self-controlled* were mixed, with the Spring 97 group ranking the value as less important and the other two groups ranking it as important.

After formal instruction in ethics, do the rankings of the terminal and instrumental values

change, and, if so, to what degree? The data reveal that some small changes occurred in value salience among the groups. Most of these changes resulted in the shift of some values up or down one or two ranks. Only three values moved enough to change their importance: *a comfortable life*, a terminal value, showed a small increase in salience, moving from a 9.5 ranking and the bottom half of the list on the pre-test to an 8 ranking and the top half of the list on the post-test for the Fall 97 group. This change seems small indeed if one examines the mean ranking for the value (8.8 on the pre- and 8.4 on the post-test). Two instrumental values, *self-controlled* and *courageous*, showed decreases in salience, moving from a ranking of 9 and 7 respectively, to a ranking of 12 and 11.

Discussion

Students in this study were apparently very much in touch with the postmodern culture's values. They showed a high degree of emphasis on the self. They valued freedom and were free of inner conflict. For the most part, they valued the prosperity that results in a comfortable life. Further, the students did not think being dutiful and respectful is very important, and they did not value being consistent and rational. A few considered themselves self-controlled, but most others did not value self-control. These results are reflective of postmodern culture with its emphasis on the individual and its lack of respect for rules and authority.

On the other hand, students in the three ethics classes overwhelmingly rejected the postmodern notion that, like others in the culture, they are not *courageous* in standing up for their beliefs and that they are not dependable or reliable (*responsible*).

The most obvious conclusion to be drawn from the data, of course, is that student value system changes were small. Somewhat disturbing is the observation that two values initially ranked as less important (*courageous, self-controlled)* actually decreased in salience. If the ethics course activities had been as successful in motivating change as one might have hoped, these values would have increased, not decreased, in salience. After all, standing up for your beliefs (*courageous)* and being restrained and self-disciplined *(self-controlled)* are important aspects of good ethical decision making. An increase in salience for these values might have indicated some attempt to fight the inconsistencies and peculiarities of postmodern culture. Too, students resisted the challenge to value rationality more highly. Postmodern culture does not emphasize or respect reason, yet reason is important in ethical decision making. Although it improved several ranks, the *logical* value failed to move from the "less important" to the "important" half of the list.

There is something of a postmodern paradox here. Students value being responsible and standing up for their beliefs, but do not value being dutiful and respectful. Neither do they much value being self-controlled and logical. It could be argued that this finding exposes the soft, inconsistent underbelly of postmodern culture. Can one be responsible but not respectful and self-disciplined? Can one stand up for one's beliefs (*courageous)* yet reject consistency and rationality *(logical)* as important? Students in this study apparently think so.

Other important observations may be made from the data. For example, *family security* was important. This value was consistently ranked among the top five. *Ambitious* was also

highly valued, as was *true friendship*. A true cynic might argue that these three values could be linked to postmodern culture's emphasis on the self, since the individual figures prominently in each. As noted earlier, most of the changes in value salience occurred in the middle of the values lists. For example, *intellectual* improved five ranks (from 10th to 5th) for the Summer 98 group, while *capable* lost three and a half ranks (from 8 ½ to 12th).

This study's one inescapable conclusion, of course, is that the observed changes were small. Students in the three ethics classes demonstrated that neither knowledge of postmodern culture (the ethical issues raised by cultural practices and how those issues are being addressed) nor the ethical philosophies and case studies presented in class was sufficient to motivate much change in their value systems. Clearly, as the Black et. al (1992) study noted, "much more extensive research is needed" (p. 8).

Value	Pre-Test		Post Test		Rank Change
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Happiness	5.1	1	4.3	1	0
Self-Respect	5.6	2	4.9	2	0
Inner Harmony	6.1	3	5.9	5	-2
Family Security	6.2	4	5.6	4	0
Freedom	6.7	5	5.4	3	+2
True Friendship	6.8	6	7.5	6	0
Wisdom	7.6	7	7.9	7	0
Mature Love	8.4	8	9.6	8	0
Accomplishment	9.4	9	9.9	9	0
Comfortable Life	9.6	10	10.7	11	-1
Pleasure	10.5	11	10.6	10	+1
Salvation	11.2	12	11.0	14	-2
Exciting Life	11.4	13	12.3	15	-2
Equality	11.7	14	10.8	12	+2
World @ Peace	11.9	15	10.9	13	+2
Social Recognition	13.6	16	14.6	17	-1
World of Beauty	14.0	17	14.9	18	-1
National Security	15.3	18	14.1	16	+2

Table 1:Terminal Value Means and Ranks for Spring 97 Group

Value	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Rank Change
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Honest	4.7	1	4.5	1	0
Loving	5.5	2	5.4	2	0
Responsible	6.3	3	6.2	3	0
Independent	6.7	4	6.8	4	0
Ambitious	7.0	5	8.2	6	-1
Broadminded	7.7	6	9.4	8	-2
Courageous	8.3	7	9.6	8	-1
Intellectual	8.4	8	7.9	5	+3
Imaginative	9.3	9	10.6	13	-4
Capable	9.5	10	9.0	7	+3
Helpful	10.7	11.5	9.7	10	+1.5
Polite	10.7	11.5	10.0	11	+0.5
Cheerful	11.0	13	11.4	15	-2
Forgiving	11.3	14	10.5	12	+2
Logical	11.4	15	12.0	16	-1
Self-Controlled	12.7	16	11.0	14	+2
Clean	13.9	17	13.4	17	0
Obedient	15.1	18	15.1	18	0

Table 2: Instrumental Value Means and Ranks for Spring 97 Group

Value	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Rank Change
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Happiness	4.5	1	5.1	1	0
Self-Respect	4.6	2	5.2	2	0
Family Security	5.3	3	5.3	3	0
Inner Harmony	6.5	4	7.1	5	-1
Freedom	6.8	5	6.1	4	+1
True Friendship	8.1	6	8.0	6	0
Accomplishment	8.4	7	8.3	7	0
Mature Love	8.7	8	8.5	9	-1
Comfortable Life	8.8	9.5	8.4	8	+1.5
Wisdom	8.8	9.5	9.1	10	-0.5
Salvation	10.4	11	9.4	11	0
World @ Peace	11.5	12	11.4	13	-1
Equality	11.8	13	10.1	12	+1
Pleasure	12.0	14	12.1	14	0
An Exciting Life	12.3	15	12.4	15	0
Social Recognition	13.3	16	15.1	17	-1
National Security	14.2	17	13.2	16	+1
World of Beauty	14.4	18	15.5	18	0

Table 3: Terminal Value Means and Ranks for Fall 97 Group

Value	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Rank Change
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Honest	4.4	1	3.2	1	0
Ambitious	5.5	2	6.4	3	-1
Loving	6.0	3	6.6	4	-1
Responsible	6.7	4	5.5	2	+2
Independent	7.4	5	6.8	5	0
Forgiving	7.5	6	9.0	6	0
Courageous	7.9	7	9.2	8	-1
Broadminded	8.2	8	9.1	7	+1
Self-Controlled	10.1	8	10.3	12	-3
Capable	10.2	10	9.4	9	+1
Intellectual	10.3	11	9.7	11	0
Cheerful	11.0	12	12.6	17	-5
Helpful	11.1	13	11.1	13	0
Imaginative	12.0	14.5	12.1	14	+0.5
Logical	12.0	14.5	9.5	10	+4.5
Polite	12.2	16	12.5	15.5	+0.5
Clean	12.3	17	12.5	15.5	+1.5
Obedient	14.7	18	14.2	18	0

Table 4: Instrumental Value Means and Ranks for Fall 97 Group

Value	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Rank Change
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Self-Respect	4.6	1	4.7	1	0
Happiness	5.8	2	5.8	2	0
Family Security	6.4	3	6.8	5	-2
Freedom	6.5	4	7.0	6	-2
Wisdom	6.7	5	6.5	3	+2
Accomplishment	7.3	6	7.2	7	-1
True Friendship	7.7	7	7.3	8	-1
Comfortable Life	7.9	8	9.6	9	-1
Inner Harmony	8.3	9	6.7	4	+5
Mature Love	9.7	10	10.1	10.5	-0.5
Equality	10.5	11	10.1	10.5	+0.5
Exciting Life	11.6	12	11.7	13	-1
Pleasure	11.9	13	13.0	15	-2
World @ Peace	12.2	14	12.0	14	0
Salvation	12.3	15	11.3	12	+3
Social Recognition	12.7	16	13.4	16	0
National Security	14.3	17	14.0	18	-1
World of Beauty	14.6	18	13.7	17	+1

Table 5: Terminal Value Means and Ranks for Summer 98 Group

Value	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Rank Change
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
Responsible	4.5	1	3.4	1.5	-0.5
Honest	4.7	2	3.4	1.5	+0.5
Independent	6.8	3	7.7	4	-1
Ambitious	7.8	4	8.7	8	-4
Loving	8.0	5	7.4	3	+2
Broadminded	8.3	6	8.7	7	-1
Courageous	8.4	7	9.7	11	-4
Capable	9.0	8.5	10.0	12	-3.5
Self-Controlled	9.0	8.5	8.3	6	+2.5
Intellectual	9.6	10	7.8	5	+5
Forgiving	10.0	11	9.6	10	+1
Helpful	10.7	12	9.3	9	+3
Cheerful	11.0	13	10.8	16	-3
Polite	11.3	14	11.0	14	0
Imaginative	11.6	15	12.7	15	0
Logical	12.3	16	10.7	13	+3
Clean	12.8	17	14.5	18	-1
Obedient	15.3	18	13.6	17	+1

Table 6 Instrumental Value Means and Ranks for Summer 98 Group

REFERENCES

Appignanesi, R. & Garrett, C. 1995. Introducing postmodernism. New York: Totem Books.

Associated Press report. 1988, January 12. Students value money over mind, survey finds. St. Petersburg Times, section A, p. 4.

Black, J., Rawlins, B., Viall, E., & Plumley, J. 1992. Effects of a media ethics course on student values: A replication and expansion. Presented to the Mass Communication and Society Division, AEJMC National Conference, August 5-8.

Bok, S. 1995. Common values. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Connor, S. 1997. Postmodernist culture. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Fekete, J. 1987. Introductory notes for a postmodern value system. In J. Fekete (Ed.), Life after postmodernism. New York: St. Martin's.

Finegan, J. & Theriault, C. 1997. The relationship between personal values and the perception of the corporation's code of ethics. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27 (8): 708-724.

Fritzsche, D. J. 1995. Personal values: Potential keys to ethical decision making. Journal of Business Ethics, 14: 909-922.

Gitlin, T. 1999. Postmodernism defined, at last! In K. B. Massey (Ed.), Readings in Mass Communication. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Lickona, T. 1980. What does moral psychology have to say to the teacher of ethics? In D. Callahan & S. Bok (Eds.), Ethics teaching in higher education. New York: Plenum Press.

Rokeach, M. 1973. The nature of human values. New York: Free Press.

Rosen, B. 1980. The teaching of undergraduate ethics. In D. Callahan & S. Bok (Eds.), Ethics teaching in higher education. New York: Plenum Press.

Surlin, S. H. 1987. Value system changes by students as a result of media ethics course. Journalism Quarterly, 64 (2/3): 564-568, 676.